

JOURNAL
of
EARLY SOUTHERN
DECORATIVE ARTS

November, 1982
Volume VIII, Number 2
The Museum of Early Southern
Decorative Arts

MESDA ANNUAL MEMBERSHIPS

Benefactor	*
Patron	\$500 and up
Sustaining	\$200 to \$499
Contributing	\$100 to \$199**
Corporate or Foundation	\$100 and up
Active.	\$ 25 to \$ 99
Joint	\$ 20
Individual	\$ 15***

* Persons who contribute valuable antiquities are considered Benefactors of MESDA. Once named a Benefactor, a person remains such for life and enjoys all the privileges of a Member of MESDA.

** A contribution of \$100.00 or more entitles the member to bring guests to the museum free of charge.

*** Non-profit Institutions may subscribe to the *Journal* only, receiving two issues per annum at the rate of \$8.00.

Overseas members please add \$5.00 for airmail postage.

PRIVILEGES

Members of the Museum of Early Southern Decorative Arts receive the *Journal* twice yearly in May and November, as well as the MESDA newsletter, the *Luminary*, which is published in February and August. Other privileges include advance notification of the classes and programs and lectures offered by the Museum, an Annual Member's Weekend with reports from the MESDA Research staff, a 10% discount on bookstore purchases, and free admission to the Museum.

The Museum of Early Southern Decorative Arts is owned and operated by Old Salem, Inc., the non-profit corporation that is responsible for the restoration and operation of Old Salem, Moravian Congregation Town founded in 1766. MESDA is an educational institution with the established purpose of collecting, preserving, documenting and researching representative examples of southern decorative arts and craftsmanship from the 1600s to 1820. The Museum exhibits its collection for public interest and study.

For further information, please write to MESDA, Box 10310, Salem Srarion, Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27108. Telephone (919) 722-6148.

JOURNAL
of
EARLY SOUTHERN
DECORATIVE ARTS

November, 1982
Volume VIII, Number 2
Published twice yearly in
May and November by
The Museum of Early Southern Decorative Arts

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

JOHN BIVINS, JR., *Chairman*

FRANCES GRIFFIN

BRADFORD RAUSCHENBERG

SALLY GANT

Copyright © 1982 Old Salem, Inc.
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27108

Printed by Hall Printing Company
High Point, North Carolina

Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	1
<i>William Buckland and William Bernard Sears: the Designer and the Carver</i>	7
LUKE BECKERDITE	
<i>William Buckland Reconsidered: Architectural Carving in Chesapeake Maryland, 1771-1774</i>	43
LUKE BECKERDITE	



Introduction

This issue of the *Journal* is somewhat unusual, both in that it treats but a single subject and that it presents the work of a single author. Architectural carving, the subject considered here, in fact had been planned as the single study to be presented in this issue. Earlier plans called for an examination of twelve carved Charleston interiors in the Rococo style, dating from the 1765-1775 period, along with Mr. Beckerdite's interpretation of William Buckland's work. It became apparent, however, that the body of carving encompassed by Mr. Beckerdite's intensive study contained far too much technical and stylistic information to be slighted by condensation into a single article. It is no exaggeration to describe the Virginia and Maryland work contained here as some of the most important American interior architecture of the Rococo period. Many other building studies, along with dozens of photographic details recorded by Mr. Beckerdite, could not be published here due to lack of space, and due also to the fact that the buildings could not be directly associated with Buckland from either stylistic or documentary viewpoints. As the reader will observe, work on the periphery of the Buckland "school" even leads to Philadelphia shops in very direct fashion, though in view of other cultural ties between coastal Maryland and Philadelphia, this should not be considered unusual. At the same time, the evidence of London journeymen is present, just as it is in other major examples of architectural carving well south of Maryland.

The art of carving is a subject that has not received proper attention in scholarly press. In addition to representing a major form of decoration in the eighteenth century, architectural carving can also provide a very real tie with the production of urban furniture in this country, and even offer the possibility of

identifying artisans employed by specialty carving houses and cabinet shops. The sideboard table illustrated in this issue, in fact, has been soundly attributed by Mr. Beckerdite to both its designer and carver, and may well represent the only known example of architect-designed furniture in America.

A critical comparative study of carved work, wherever it may occur, depends a great deal upon the observer's ability to think like a carver. It is impossible to make completely valid associations between various examples of carving without an understanding of the basic technology of the art. Evidence of the techniques which a carver had learned, and the tools which he used to employ those techniques, were left behind in the style of his work, from rough outlining cuts to finish modelling and veining. A close examination of such details, if the work isn't wholly glugged with paint or other finishes, reveals that carving is just as complexly individualistic as any other form of decorative surface treatment. Each carver left "signatures" of his own working style as surely as if he had incised his name on the work, such as the curious lancet-like leaf "eyes" cut by the Virginia carver Bernard Sears.

Carving is a trade which requires a relatively large number of hand tools, which in estate inventories of artisans in the wood-working trade are usually described simply as "gouges" and "chisels." Carving tools were actually quite varied. Carvers used more gouges than any other type of tool, since they were used for making all sorts of radiused cuts, whether outlining or finishing. Gouges were offered by Sheffield cutlers in a bewildering array of sizes and radii, each different radius being assigned a group number. They ranged from almost flat tools, barely hollow at all, to steeply-radiused tools having edges almost in the shape of a "U"; such gouges were generally called "veiners." In describing these hollow tools, Mr. Beckerdite describes them in terms of their radius; when he mentions a "lightly radiused gouge," for example, he describes one of the flatter gouges that a carver might refer to as a quarter-round. Other standard tools used by carvers consisted of various sizes of flat chisels, short and long "bent" or curved chisels and gouges, parting or "V" tools, and the like. Some of these tools, and the fashion in which they were used, are shown here in a procedural sequence of cutting a leaf similar to those cut by Bernard Sears. It is hoped that by this the reader will find it easier to understand the technical aspects of Mr. Beckerdite's analysis, and will be able to use such

information in the examination of other carving. For those who wish to study traditional carving methods further, the editor recommends *Woodcarving* by William Wheeler and Charles Hayward (New York: Drake Publishers, 1972).



1. With the design for half a relief-carved flower drawn, the ground is roughed away with gouges. The design is after the style of the Virginia carver William Bernard Sears.




2. The design is then set-in or "stabbed" with various radii of gouges.



3. With the remaining ground close to the design having been cut away, the design is then rough-modelled with larger sizes of gouges.



4. *The "eye" which occurs at the fold of a leaf is set-in with a lightly-radiused gouge (quarter-round), and the waste then picked out.*



5. *The lobes of leaves are defined by a vertical cut with a lightly-radiused gouge, followed by an angling cut of the same tool to remove waste.*



6. *The modelling of the leaves is completed with medium-radiused gouges . . . followed by veining with small, sharply-radiused gouges.*



7. *The ground, in some areas, is then stippled with a punch. The other half of the flower is shown here rough-drawn.*

There are several important points regarding early carving which are made clear in Mr. Beckerdite's work. One of these is that we should not be hasty with attributions. The diverse work associated with Buckland, as the reader will see, was actually the work of a number of carvers employed by Buckland. We often have the tendency to measure the work of an early artisan by our own modern views of hand work, which can be an unrealistic and even romantic approach. While we may place a very high value on hand work today, an early shop master such as Buckland more than likely fancied himself at the drawing board or in the counting-house rather than at the bench. Further, it is evident that the journeyman carvers themselves had a relatively free hand in the final interpretation of designs.

Also, we are often eager to associate formal carved work with published design sources available to builders and carvers. Although such associations are indeed important, since they often prove just how modish the work of a certain artisan might have been during his own time, we must also credit the carvers for having the ability to design in their own right. Part of their training included draftsmanship and drawing, and it is abundantly clear that many American carvers used published designs for no more than readily-available, if expensive, sources of inspiration rather than seeing them as stylistic tenets which required slavish copying. While exact copies certainly exist, the greater body of surviving architectural and furniture carving in this country flowed more from the minds and hands of the tradesmen cutting it than from the burins of British engravers.

JOHN BIVINS, JR.
Editor



Figure 1. Gunston Hall, Lorton, Virginia, 1750-1760. MESDA research file S-11380.

William Buckland and William Bernard Sears: the Designer and the Carver

LUKE BECKERDITE

The trades in mid-eighteenth-century London, the city where William Buckland served his apprenticeship, were characterized by a remarkable degree of specialization. Designers, ranging from Batty Langley to Thomas Johnson, produced innumerable plates of furniture designs, architectural elevations, and ornamental details which could be copied or interpreted by independent tradesmen. This type of differentiated designer-tradesman relationship, rare in colonial America, finds its closest parallel in carving now attributed to the hand of William Bernard Sears and the design of William Buckland.

William Buckland was born in the parish of St. Peter's-in-the-East, Oxford, England on 14 August 1734 to yeoman Francis Buckland and his wife Mary.¹ At fourteen, the customary age for indentures, William was bound to James Buckland, "Citizen and Joiner of London, to learn his Art; . . ."² Although Buckland served the full seven years of his apprenticeship, there is no record of his being admitted as a freeman of the Joiner's Company. On 4 August 1755, only four months after completing his apprenticeship, William Buckland signed an indenture with Thomson Mason, agreeing to serve Mason, "his Executors or Assigns in the Plantation of Virginia beyond the Seas, for the Space of four years . . . in the Employment of a Carpenter & Joiner." In addition to his transportation, provisions, and lodging, Buckland was to be paid a yearly salary of twenty pounds sterling.³ Thomson Mason was apparently instructed by his brother, George, to secure the employment of a competent tradesman to supervise the

carpenter's and joiner's work on his house, Gunston Hall (Fig. 1). This Baroque five bay Flemish bond brick house with stone quoins and double chimneys at each end was described by George Mason's son as “. . . a substantial brick mansion, 40 by 70 feet,” bounded by the Potomac River and Pohick Creek about ten miles south of Alexandria.⁴




Figure 2. Detail of opposing C-scrolls with pierced, “ruffled leafage” set into one of the spandrels of the elliptical arches at Gunston Hall. All of the carving at Gunston Hall is attributed to William Bernard Sears, 1755-1760. MESDA research file S-11380.

From his arrival at Mason's estate to 8 November 1759, William Buckland had the “entire Direction of the Carpenter's & Joiner's Work of a large House.”⁵ This notation, made by Mason on the back of Buckland's indenture upon the completion of his term of service, suggests that Buckland acted primarily as a designer and as supervisor of the Gunston Hall workmen. Information regarding the tradesmen under Buckland's direction is limited to a suit, largely for back wages, instituted by a journeyman, James Brent, on 6 July 1763.⁶ Brent presented a detailed account against Buckland for one year's wages in 1760, nine and one-half months work and “37½ days work at Colo. Masons” in 1761, seven months, sixteen days in 1762, and two months work in 1763. Also enumerated were expenses incurred on Buckland's behalf, the most significant entry recording “To Pare Shoes to Bernard Sears” in 1759.⁷

Oral history bears out Sears' connection with Gunston Hall. In the 1936 publication, *Memories of a Plain Family*, Susan A. Plaskett wrote:

It is thought that William Bernard Sears also did the exquisite carving in Gunston Hall . . . my mother who got the information from her old schoolmaster told me.

Charles Lee Sears said that his fathers passage to Virginia was paid by George Mason, who claimed his services until the amount had been repaid by labor. In his spare moments, he practiced wood carving. When the time of his service was about completed, Mr. Mason noticed some of the carved pieces of wood . . . he employed Mr. Sears to do the carved work in Gunston Hall.⁸

Although this description of Sears as a novice carver is somewhat questionable, the history's direct line of descent, from William Bernard Sears to his son Charles Lee (born in Fairfax County 20 February 1776),⁹ to the author's mother gives it additional credibility. This is further supported by Sears' obituary notice which stated that he was, "a native of England," and "lived for a considerable time in the family of George Mason of Gunston."¹⁰



Figure 3. Detail of door casement molding in the central hall at Gunston Hall. MESDA research file S-11380.

In light of these accounts, a technical study of the carving in Gunston Hall and its relationship to work both attributed and documented to Sears provides sufficient evidence to attribute Gunston to his hand. This examination will proceed chronologically, with emphasis on interrelated details, since Buckland's shop, which presumably included Sears, relocated to Richmond County, Virginia in 1761.¹¹

Architectural carving in Gunston Hall is limited to the central hall, dining room, and drawing room. Flanking pairs of opposing C-scrolls with stemmed flowers and pierced, ruffled leafage are set in the spandrels of the elliptical arches in the hall (Fig. 2). In describing Rococo carving, terms like "ruffled leafage" are arbitrary, since such designs were often stylized composites of natural forms. Typical of Rococo carving, the piercings of these leaves are rusticated with small gouge cuts, giving the appearance of jagged edges, a stylistic detail noted in documented Sears work (Fig. 30).

More distinctive, however, are the small “eyes” behind the overlapping leaves of the spandrel flowers (Fig. 2), on moldings in the central hall (Fig. 3) and on leafage under the window entablature in the drawing room (Fig. 4), and stair bracket acanthus (Fig. 5). These eyes were formed by two slightly angled, parallel stabbing cuts with a small, lightly-radiused gouge, rather than the normal single vertical cut with a medium radiused gouge, followed by two slightly angled cuts with a gouge having a light radius. The eyes of Gunston leafage appear more as a space behind overlapping lobes than a fold in the leaf.

The ends and lobes of the stair bracket leaves, formed primarily by vertical cuts with medium and lightly-radiused gouges of varying widths, are repeated, though in more simplified form, in the molding in the hall (Fig. 3), under the drawing room windows entablatures (Fig. 4), and on the pendant between the hallway arches (Fig. 6). Considerable undercutting and surface articulation are also characteristic of carving attributed to Sears. On the acanthus of the stair brackets and the keystones of the arches of the drawing room cupboards (Fig. 7) the leaves are modelled with rather deep, wide flutes which are frequently veined with a smaller gouge. The resulting high ridges, which often have undercut outer edges, give the carving a “fussy” appearance. The scroll ends of the stair brackets (Fig. 5) and bottom of the suspended stair landing newel post (Fig. 8) are fully articulated with parallel flutes made with a small gouge. On the newel post, the ends of the leaves at each corner are shaded with short flutes which run perpendicular to the flow of the leaves, an unusual detail which occurs in other contexts in this carver’s work. In naturalistic carving, overturned leaves are often shaded in this way.

George Mason’s written recommendation that Buckland “Directed” the carpenter’s and joiner’s work at Gunston Hall and was a “complete Master of the . . . Business both in Theory & Practice,” suggests that Buckland provided the interior elevations and possibly the basic design of the carved details.¹² The imbricated consoles in the dining room (Fig. 11) may have been inspired by similar details illustrated in Thomas Chippendale’s *Gentleman and Cabinetmaker’s Director*,¹³ which was listed among several design books in Buckland’s estate inventory.¹⁴ These consoles were modelled by making vertical cuts followed by hollowing cuts with a gouge, a technique referred to as “chip carving.” Imbrication as a decorative detail would have been




Figure 4. Detail of a window surround, consisting of fluted pilasters and full entablature, in the drawing room at Gunston Hall. MESDA research file S-11380.

familiar to both the designer and the carver. Possibly derived from Chinese designs, imbricated patterns appear in European textiles by the seventeenth century.



Figure 5. Walnut stair bracket at Gunston Hall. The central flower is replaced. MESDA research file S-11380.



Figure 6. Detail of the molding at the base of the pendant between the elliptical arches in the hall at Gunston Hall. MESDA research file S-11380.

Innovative interpretation and adaptation of familiar published stylistic details is characteristic of Buckland's work. The drawing room, for example, combines symmetrical Baroque carved details such as the acanthus on the cupboard keystones (Fig. 7) and window pediments (Fig. 4), with Rococo frets. An even greater contrast occurs between the Palladian architectural mode of the drawing room (Figs. 4, 9) and the style of the dining room, which

may be the finest example of the “Chinese taste” in America.
(Fig. 10).



*Figure 7. The arch keystone of a drawing room cupboard at Gunston Hall.
MESDA research file S-11380.*



Figure 8. Bottom of a stair landing newel post at Gunston Hall.



Figure 9. Drawing room cupboard at Gunston Hall. MESDA research file S-11380.

Buckland appears to have left journeyman James Brent in charge of completing the work at Gunston Hall, which probably ended in 1761. In November of 1760, Buckland was paid £93.2.0 by the Vestry of Truro Parish for work on the Glebe house at Pohick Church.¹⁵ His salary was taken from a £100 balance due

Thomas Waite, the original “undertaker” who had neglected his duties.¹⁶




Figure 10. Window surround in the “Chinese taste” in the dining room at Gunston Hall. MESDA research file S-11380.




Figure 11. Window console in the dining room at Gunston Hall. MESDA research file S-11380.



Figure 12. Detail of one of the carved flowers between the modillions of the cornice molding in the drawing room at Gunston Hall. MESDA research file S-11380.

English architects such as William Kent and Robert Adam traditionally designed furniture as well as architectural elevations. This is especially true of case furniture and tables, both of which were very receptive to architectural treatment. Apparently, Buckland followed the practice of his English counterparts. The Sears-attributed chair in Fig. 13 has a history of descent in the Mason family of Fairfax County, and may have originally belonged to George Mason. The fluting of the scroll ends of the leg brackets (Figs. 14, 15) is virtually identical to the stair bracket scrolls in Gunston Hall (Fig. 5). Both scroll ends are fully articulated with




Figure 13. Side chair attributed to the Buckland shop, carving attributed to Sears, 1755-60. Black walnut; seat height 16½, width 21⅞, DOA 20. The slip-seat rabbet, crest, splat, and nailed-on shoe were removed 1830-50 and pine boards screwed to the stiles to make a crude easy chair. MESDA acc. 3464.

small parallel flutes and have deeply fluted inside lobes. The small leaves flowing from the ends also have short perpendicular flutes like the newel post carving in Fig. 8. A conceptual relationship can also be seen in the pairs of short flutes inside the scroll. Similar fluting occurs in several of the moldings at Gunston Hall (Figs. 3, 6). The treatment of the legs is somewhat unusual in that the sides are fluted (Fig. 15), while the fronts have geometric fret-work carved from the solid (Fig. 14). Unfortunately, the chair has been extensively reworked, having been converted into an easy chair before 1850. Originally a side chair, the crest and splat



Figure 14. Detail of front leg fret and bracket of chair illustrated in Figure 13.

were removed, and the back stiles cut down to accommodate the addition of arms. In addition to producing furniture, Buckland's shop made coffins. In 1760, the estate of John Ferguson credited Buckland for a coffin for the deceased valued at £0:15:0. Also included in the audit of the estate is a 1761 credit on account of Isaac Rose, which is the last known reference to Buckland in Fairfax County.¹⁷

By December of 1761, Buckland and his workmen had moved to Richmond County, Virginia,¹⁸ where they eventually settled near Warsaw, across the river from Tappahannock.¹⁹ He may have



Figure 15. Detail of the bracket and fluting on the side of the front leg of the chair illustrated in Figure 13.

received his first commission shortly after his arrival there. On 5 October 1761, the Richmond County Court instructed the sheriff to “Employ Some Person to Repair and make an addition of Twelve Feet” to the prison.²⁰ Buckland received £7:12:5 for the repairs and addition in August 1764,²¹ although the work had been completed over eleven months earlier.²² In light of this tardy payment, it is interesting that he was fined by the Richmond County Grand Jury for being a “Common profane Swearer” in May, 1764.²³



Figure 16. Mount Airy, Warsaw, Virginia, 1750-1760. MESDA research file S-11633.

There is substantial evidence that Buckland’s men were working at John Tayloe’s house, Mount Airy (Fig. 16),²⁴ by the fall of 1762. On 16 October 1762 Tayloe wrote Landon Carter that

I shall be much obliged to you to give Garland directions to run out the division line between us of Thomas’ Land having ordered Mr. Sallard to have my out fences made remarkably Stout . . . then proceed to scour my ditches &. right up my fences and hedges &. if you would ride up to Mt. Airy sometimes &. give your friendly hints of admonition to Mr. Buckland I believe it would be doing me no small service.²⁵

From Tayloe's letter it appears that the exterior of Mount Airy was completed, although his choice of the word "sometimes" in reference to Buckland suggests that interior construction or remodelling was being done. Work at Mount Airy may have continued through 1764, since there are numerous debit entries in the *Account Book-Letterbook of John Tayloe (1721-1779)* for meat and other provisions purchased by Buckland from December 1761 to November 1764.²⁶ John Tayloe also provided security for Buckland in a lawsuit for £240 in damages claimed by John Tarpley in 1763²⁷ and £300 claimed by Hugh Walker in 1764.²⁸



Figure 17. Detail of cornice molding from Mount Airy. Carving attributed to William Bernard Sears, 1761-1765. MESDA research file S-11633.

Fragments of carved cornice molding which survived the 1844 fire that gutted Mount Airy²⁹ are related to other work attributed to Buckland's shop. The leaves in the molding below the dentil course (Fig. 17) are articulated with short parallel flutes, an unusual detail noted on moldings at Gunston Hall (Figs. 3, 6) and the leg brackets of the chair in Figs. 13, 14, and 15. The modelling of the leaf ends is also stylistically related to the stair bracket acanthus in Fig. 5 and the central bellflower of the sideboard table (Fig. 18). Part of the original furnishings of Mount Airy, the sideboard table has a probable history of ownership by John Tayloe (1721-1779).

Attribution of this table to Buckland's shop is borne out by an examination of its construction. A haunched tenon, partially exposed at the top, is pinned into a mortise left open at the bottom of the leg stile (Fig. 19). This type of mortise-and-tenon



Figure 18. Sideboard table attributed to the shop of William Buckland with carving attributed to William Bernard Sears, 1761-1770, walnut throughout. HOA: 33", W'OA: 42 $\frac{7}{16}$ ", DOA: 25 $\frac{1}{2}$ ", dimensions not including the original marble top. MESDA accession 3425.



Figure 19. Detail of mortise-and-tenon joint used in the construction of the table, illustrated in Figure 18.




Figure 20. Plate thirty-eight of *Thomas Chippendale's Gentleman and Cabinet-maker's Director*, second edition, published in London in 1755.



Figure 21. Detail of moldings and central carving on the front rail of the table illustrated in Figure 18.

is occasionally encountered in mantle construction, where such joints are concealed with moldings or other architectural elements. Re-enforcing each joint is an L-shaped block of wood (removed in illustration), attached to the rail and upper leg stile with screws. In cabinet work, leg blocks of this type are normally secured with glue and/or nails rather than screws, which are more typical of

architectural work. Further indications of joiner's work can be seen in the table's weak glue joints and face-nailed moldings. Despite being fire blued in the forge, these large wrought, finishing nails would have been quite visible when the table was made. The same nails were used to secure the separate, chamfered leg blocks. Although the carving in the legs is undercut slightly, varnish lines indicate that the leg blocks are original. Heavy-handed architectural moldings like the egg-and-dart beneath the top and carved ogee moldings surrounding the feet are also atypical of table construction.



Figure 22. Detail of foot and leg moldings and carving of the table illustrated in Figure 18.



Figure 23. Detail of the leg carving and rail moldings of the table illustrated in Figure 18.

The design of the table was derived from the "Sideboard Table" (Fig. 20) illustrated in plate thirty-eight of the first and second editions of Chippendale's *Director* (plate fifty-nine of the third edition); however, the Tayloe table shows several innovative departures from the original engraving. Aside from obvious alterations to the design of the major carved elements, egg-and-dart and rope moldings are applied to the rails. The fret, now missing from the front rail, was of the same circular pattern as the fret over the drawing room windows at Gunston Hall (Fig. 4).

The table's carved details, which provide the strongest link to Buckland's shop, are attributed to William Bernard Sears. The lobes and edges of the central bellflower and acanthus leaves (Fig. 21) are delineated with vertical cuts with medium and lightly-radiused gouges, then fluted like the stair bracket acanthus at Gunston Hall (Fig. 5). The bellflower lobes also have high ridges

with one undercut edge. In Sears-attributed carving this is often the result of a deep modelling flute with a moderately-radiused gouge and a horizontal relieving cut with a medium-radiused gouge. The flanking S-scrolls in the center of the front rail are unusual in having their fluted outer edges rusticated with small gouge cuts. Judging from the absence of tool marks on the rail, it would appear that the work was glued to a flat surface and carved before being glued to the table. The thin, fluted edge of the scrolls would probably have broken under the weight of the vertical gouge cuts had the work not been securely fastened. As observed in the work at Gunston Hall, the carving on the table is fully articulated. This is especially true of the leg and rail acanthus (Figs. 21, 22), flowers (Fig. 23), and scroll ends (Fig. 21). Identical scroll treatment can be seen in the leg brackets of the Sears-attributed chair in Fig. 13 and the stair brackets at Gunston Hall (Fig. 5).

Evidently, Buckland's shop produced furniture on a regular basis. On 6 February 1766, Robert Wormley Carter wrote that "Buckland this day brought home my Bookcase cost £6:0:0 also put up my Chimney piece of carved work, £2:10:6 . . . also a Plan of a House £1:1:6 . . . this Plan he drew some time agoe."³⁰ John Tayloe may also have referred to furniture made in Buckland's shop when he informed Landon Carter that, "8 chairs and 2 elbow ones . . . are in Buckland's hands to sell."³¹ Unfortunately, it is unclear whether the chairs were made or merely offered for sale by Buckland. More conclusive evidence of furniture production by the Buckland shop can be found in John Randall's apprentice indenture, signed 2 April 1765:

This indenture witnesseth that John Randall son of Thomas Randall Decd. of the County of King George, doth put himself Apprentice to William Buckland of the County of Richmond, Joiner &. Cabinett Maker to learn his art . . .³²

The only other known Buckland apprentice was John Ariss Callis of Westmoreland County, bound 1 August 1768. However, in that indenture Buckland is referred to as a carpenter and joiner.³³ John Tayloe's neighbor, Landon Carter, also bespoke work from Buckland's shop. Landon Carter's diary entry for 11 September 1766 notes that "Buckland's two men began to work at 3/6 per day. Clear of sickness and Sundays."³⁴

Buckland began to have disciplinary problems with his workmen in 1769. On 7 August of that year joiner John Ewing was ordered to serve twenty-one months after the expiration of his indenture for "Loss of time and Charges in regaining him."³⁵ Samuel Bailey, a convict servant and house joiner imported in February, 1770, ran away in July, 1770³⁶ and again in 1771.³⁷ Apparently, Bailey was apprehended or returned voluntarily, since he is listed in Buckland's estate inventory in 1774.³⁸ Aside from Ewing, Bailey, James Brent, and William Bernard Sears, only two other tradesmen have been associated with Buckland's Richmond County shop. They are an anonymous blacksmith mentioned in Landon Carter's diary,³⁹ and a London carver described by Buckland as a "masterly hand" in a 25 March 1771 letter to Robert Carter of Nomini Hall.⁴⁰

By late November 1771 William Buckland and at least four tradesmen from his Richmond County shop moved to Annapolis, Maryland to complete the construction of a house that Edward Lloyd IV had purchased from Samuel Chase in July.⁴¹ Lloyd's decision to hire Buckland may have been influenced by his wife, Elizabeth Tayloe; her father had bespoken work from Buckland earlier. In a letter of attorney, proven 7 November 1772, Buckland authorized Benjamin Branham to, "State, adjust, and settle Accounts," in his name. Here he refers to himself as being, "of the City of Annapolis . . . Architect."⁴²



Figure 24. Pohick Church, Fairfax County, Virginia, 1769-1775.

It is not known when William Bernard Sears left Buckland's employ, but by June 1772 he was receiving payment for work on Pohick Church (Fig. 24) in Fairfax County, Virginia.⁴³ The original contractor for Pohick Church was Daniel French, who had made "Articles of Agreement" with the vestry of Truro Parish to build a church on 7 April 1769. The "Articles" specified that the church was to be built

. . . of good Bricks well burnt . . . The Corners of the House, the Pedistals, the Doors with the Pediment heads to be of good white free stone, and Returns and Arches of the Windows . . . of rubbed brick . . . the Window and Door Cases to be made with double architraves . . . The Isles to be laid with flagg-stone, well squared and Jointed . . . The Alter-Piece to be twenty feet high and fifteen feet wide, and done with wainscot after the Ionic Order. The floor of the Communion Place to be raised twelve inches higher than the floor of the House, with hand rails and banisters of proper size. The Apostles Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the ten Commandments to be neatly Painted on the Alter-piece in black letters . . . The Pulpit, Canopy, and reading Desks, to be of pine, wainscoted with proper Cornice and executed in the Ionic Order . . .⁴⁴

The dimensions of the altar were changed in July 1771, when they were found contrary to the proportions of the Ionic Order.⁴⁵

On 5 June 1772, the Vestry instructed the church wardens "to agree with Persons to make such Carved ornaments on the Alter Piece as they shall Judge Proper," and gild the letters with gold leaf furnished by George Washington and George William Fairfax.⁴⁶ From 25 June 1772 to 18 February 1774, Sears was credited with work done on Pohick Church,⁴⁷ and on 25 February 1774 he presented an account for carved work amounting to £58:19:0.⁴⁸ The vestry approved Sears' account and it was ordered that Alexander Henderson pay him the exhibited sum. At the same vestry meeting, Sears was commissioned to "gild the Ornaments within the Tabernacle Frames the Palm Branch and Drapery on the Front of the Pulpit (also the Eggs on the Cornice of the small Frames if the Gold will hold out) . . . for Three Pounds ready Money."⁴⁹ Sears had purchased a set of carver's and gilder's tools from John Heaton in January 1772.⁵⁰

Although the interior of Pohick Church was destroyed during the Civil War, oral history describes Sears' work:

The Church had been practically abandoned for some years and was in a bad state of delapidation, but the beautiful carved work that had been done by William Bernard Sears, soon after the church was built, had not then been molested. My mother used to sit in the church and read the Lord's Prayer and Ten Commandments over the Chancel, and admire the gilded dove that Mr. Sears had placed high over the Pulpit. The 'Eye' which he also had made seemed to be looking at her no matter where she sat.⁵¹

Documentation supporting this description can be found in the Minutes of the Vestry of Truro Parish which refer to lettering on the altar piece and gilding.⁵² Unfortunately, the carved ornaments are not described. In addition to carving and gilding, Sears furnished dimensions and "Patterns" for the pulpit cushion and cloth for the desks and communion table. These were to be imported by George Washington along with two folio prayer books "covered with blue Turkey Leather with the name of the Parish thereon in Gold Letters."⁵³

George Washington, who was a member of the Vestry of Truro Parish, employed Sears soon after Pohick Church was completed. On 4 May 1775, Washington left Mount Vernon for Philadelphia to participate in the Second Continental Congress. He signed his commission as General and Commander in Chief of the continental army on 19 June 1775, and four days later left for camp in Cambridge, Massachusetts.⁵⁴ During Washington's absence, his estate was managed by his cousin, Lund Washington. On 20 August 1775, George Washington wrote Lund, "I wish you would quicken Lanphire and Sears about the Dining Room Chimney Piece (to be executed as mentioned in one of my last letters) as I could wish to have that end of the House compleatly finished before I return . . ."⁵⁵ Sears and Goin Lanphier, a joiner, probably began work earlier that summer.⁵⁶

On 29 September 1775, Lund Washington complained to his cousin that "Sears is still here about the chimney piece. I suppose he will finish it next week. You no doubt think him long about it, so do I, but I can assure you he is constantly at work. I think you never intended such a one and must have been mistaken in

the look of the draught of the chimney piece.”⁵⁷ Washington evidently instructed that the chimney piece in the small dining room (Fig. 25) be copied from plate fifty of Abraham Swan’s *British Architect* (Fig. 26). Sears was described as having “about one weeks work yet upon the chimney piece” when he became ill in October.⁵⁸ He was unable to return to work until November.⁵⁹ Sears appears to have finished the chimney piece in November and by December was involved in painting the “new room” and dining room.⁶⁰ On 23 December 1775, “B. Sears (Carver)” was credited £22:0:5½; however, it is not known whether this was full or partial payment for work at Mount Vernon.⁶¹



Figure 25. Chimney piece in the small dining room at Mount Vernon. Joinery by Goin Lanphier and carving by William Bernard Sears, 1775. The major carved elements are done in walnut. Photography permitted courtesy of the Mount Vernon Ladies Association. MESDA research file S-11626.




Figure 26. Plate fifty of Abraham Swan's *The British Architect*, published in London in 1745, 1750, and 1758.

Comparison of Sears' carving on the chimney piece (Fig. 25) with work attributed to him at Gunston Hall and Mount Airy is complicated by several factors. At Mount Vernon, Sears' work represents a virtual copy of a design book plate, rather than an adaptation where personal nuances of his carving style would be more evident. Moreover, the scale of the elements of the design are significantly greater than any of the Sears attributed work, and more than a decade separates their execution.



Figure 27. Detail of the uppermost element of the molding of the chimney piece illustrated in Figure 25.

The uppermost element of the molding on the dining room mantle (Fig. 27) is nearly identical to the door casing molding in the hallway at Gunston Hall (Fig. 3). Both moldings have a "chip cut" between each repeat, short parallel flutes on the leaf surfaces, similar leaf delineation, and unusual angular eyes typical of Sears-attributed carving. Like the stair bracket acanthus at Gunston Hall (Fig. 5), the lobes of the leaves on this molding were formed by vertical cuts with medium and lightly-radiused gouges. The cuts are also similar in both pattern and execution. Although these details are very distinctive, moldings *per se* are not especially useful in comparative study since their forms were relatively standard, often copied from pattern books.

The elongated tips of the acanthus leaves on the mantle frieze (Figs. 28, 29) are stylistically related to the acanthus flowing from the volutes of the Gunston Hall stair brackets (Fig. 5). In modelling the Mount Vernon acanthus (Figs. 29-31), greater emphasis was placed on veining than on clearly defining the individual lobes of the leaves. This is related to the modelling of the acanthus on the front rail of the sideboard table (Fig. 21). Characteristic of Sears-attributed carving, the ornamental consoles flanking the fireplace opening have fully articulated surfaces (Figs. 30, 31). The veining of the acanthus, with parallel flutes made with a small, medium-radiused gouge, is superior to other work attributed to Sears. This is evident in the execution of the long parallel flutes which converge just above the "ruffled shells" (Fig. 30). Similar veining on a smaller scale can be seen in the



Figure 28. Detail of carving applied on the fascia between the shelf consoles of the chimney piece illustrated in Figure 25.



Figure 29. Detail of carving applied on the fascia between the shelf consoles of the chimney piece illustrated in Figure 25.

rail and leg acanthus of the sideboard table (Figs. 21, 22). The lobes of the console acanthus leaves often have undercut edges where they overlap another lobe (Figs. 30, 31), a detail mentioned in reference to the central bellflower of the sideboard table (Fig. 21) and the keystones and stair bracket acanthus at Gunston Hall (Figs. 5, 7). An additional parallel with Gunston Hall can be seen



Figure 30. Detail of the lower section of one of the ornamental consoles flanking the fireplace opening of the chimney piece illustrated in Figure 25.

through comparison of the flower to the left in Fig. 29 and the flowers between the cornice modillions in Fig. 12. The convex petals of both flowers are formed by angled, vertical cuts with a lightly-radiused gouge, then modelled with flutes made with

a small, medium-radiused gouge. The concave petals were modelled with two horizontal cuts with a medium-radiused gouge which formed the two depressions and the peak in the center.



Figure 31. Detail of the upper section of one of the ornamental consoles flanking the fireplace opening of the chimney piece illustrated in Figure 25.

Vertical cuts with medium and lightly-radiused gouges were used to cut in the design of nearly all the carved elements on the dining room chimney piece. Only occasionally does a chisel or parting tool appear to have been employed. This predominant reliance on gouges is evident in the delineation of the pierced "ruffled shells" of the consoles flanking the fireplace opening (Fig. 30) and supporting the mantle shelf (Fig. 32). The piercings of the ornamental console shells are rusticated with small gouge cuts, a technique stylistically related to the rustication of the "ruffled leafage" at Gunston Hall (Fig. 2) and scroll treatment on the sideboard table (Fig. 21). A further stylistic relationship can be observed in the stippled backgrounds of the sideboard table fret (Figs. 18, 21, 23), Gunston Hall stair brackets (Fig. 5), and consoles below the mantle shelf at Mount Vernon (Fig. 32).



Figure 32. Shelf console of the chimney piece illustrated in Figure 25.

The carving attributed and documented to William Bernard Sears spans a period of nearly twenty years yet there is a remarkable technical and stylistic consistency to his work. It may be that his early work was influenced by William Buckland, just as the carving at Mount Vernon was directed by plate fifty of Swan's *British Architect*. However, Sears' own style was unique in many respects, and it is this individualism that makes attribution of his work possible. Moreover, it strongly suggests that Sears was deeply involved in the design as well as the execution of his carving.

FOOTNOTES

1. Rosamond Randall Beirne and John Henry Scarff, *William Buckland, 1734-1774: Architect of Virginia and Maryland* (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1959), p. 1.
2. *Joiner's Company Register of Apprentice Bindings*, Ms. 8052, V. 6, p. 47v. Guildhall Library, London, England.
3. Indenture between William Buckland and Thomson Mason, 4 August 1755. Owned by the Gunston Hall Foundation and filed with the George Mason Papers in the Gunston Hall Archives located at Gunston Hall Plantation, Lorton, VA.
4. *The Alexandria Gazette and Daily Advertiser*, 4 September 1818.
5. George Mason, written recommendation of William Buckland, 8 November 1759, inscribed on the back of Buckland's indenture to Thomson Mason.

The within named William Buckland came into Virginia with my Brother Thomson Mason who engaged him in London and had a very good Character of him there; during the time he lived with me he had the entire Direction of the Carpenter's & Joiner's Work of a large House; & having behaved very faithfully in my Service, I can with great Justice recommend him to any Gentleman that may have occasion to employ him, an honest sober diligent Man, & I think him a complete Master of the Carpenter's & Joiner's Business both in Theory & Practice.

6. *Richmond County Court Order Book 15*, 6 July 1763, pp. 143-144.
7. William Buckland Manuscripts, Ms. 162, The Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, Maryland. The earliest description of Brent's account against Buckland is found on p. 37 of Beirne and Scharff's *Buckland*. The authors' footnote for the account, "Richmond County Order Book 15, July 1763-1764, f. 293," is an incorrect citation for the original order book entry for 6 July 1763 (*Richmond County Court Order Book 15*, pp. 143-144). Moreover, the authors' footnote is for a brief order book entry rather than the detailed account they describe in *Buckland*. Accounts and other forms of evidence exhibited in Richmond County Court are separate from the court order books and are stored unbound as court papers in the Richmond County Court House in Warsaw, Va. The author of this article has been unable to locate this account and it appears to have been lost or destroyed. Fortunately, a copy of the account is included among the Buckland Manuscripts, compiled by Beirne and Scharff in preparation for *Buckland*. The copy appears to have been traced from or done in imitation of the writing in the original account. Brent's account of time against Buckland came to £50:6:8¼ which, combined with several enumerated expenses came to £51:2:8½. From the latter amount was subtracted the total of the debit side of the account, £36:9:8 leaving £14:13:0, to which was added interest of £1:4:5 for a total of £15:17:5. On 5 March 1765, Brent was awarded £15:17:5 (*Richmond County Court Order Book 15*, p. 387). Further indications of the authenticity of this copy can be found in the debit entry "To Cash pd. Charles Hammond 59/6—2:19:6." On 3 October 1763,

- James Hunter and Co. sued Buckland for £3:1:11 (*Richmond County Court Order Book 15*, p. 183). As evidence, Hunter and Co. presented Charles Hammond's account against Buckland which had a 10 June 1762 entry, "To Cred. James Brent — 2:19:6" (*Richmond County Court Papers*, 1763).
8. Susan Annie Plaskett, *Memories of a Plain Family, 1836-1936* (Washington: Franklin Press, 1936), p. 16.
 9. Samuel Pearce May, *The Descendants of Richard Saers (Sears) of Yarmouth, Massachusetts, 1638-1888* (Albany: J. Munsell's Sons, 1890), p. 605.
 10. *Alexandria Herald*, 4 May 1818.
 11. The move evidently occurred between April and December of 1761. The estate papers of John Ferguson show an 18 April 1761 credit, "By William Buckland on Acc^t of Isaac Rose — £0:08:0" (*Fairfax County Will Book B-1*, 1752-1767, p. 357). By 6 December 1761 Buckland was purchasing beef, lamb, and mutton from John Tayloe of Mount Airy in Richmond County (*Account Book-Letterbook of Stephen Loyde (1708-1711)*, *Account Book-Letterbook of John Tayloe (1687-1747)*, *Account Book-Letterbook of John Tayloe (1721-1779)*, 1717-1778, Mssl/T2118/bl, Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Va).
 12. George Mason, written recommendation of William Buckland.
 13. The library bookcases in plates 91 and 99 of the first (1754) and second (1755) editions of Thomas Chippendale's *Gentleman and Cabinetmaker's Director* have pediment brackets similar to the window and door consoles at Gunston Hall. Imbrication can also be noted in other architectural contexts, such as that used on the china cases in plates 109-111.
 14. *Anne Arundel County Inventories, 1777*, Vol. 125, p. 337. Buckland's estate inventory was taken 19 Dec. 1774. On 3 June 1777, administrators, John Randall and Denton Jacques swore that the inventory was accurate.
 15. Pohick Church, *Minutes of the Vestry: Truro Parish Virginia, 1732-1785* (Annandale, Va.: Baptie Studios, Inc., 1974), Vestry Minutes for 29 Nov. 1760, p. 82.
 16. *Ibid.*, 2 Oct. 1752, pp. 65-67; 1 June 1755, p. 71; 27 Nov. 1755, pp. 73-75; 27 Oct. 1758, pp. 77-78; and 12 Nov. 1759, p. 78-80.
 17. *Fairfax County Will Book B-1*, 1752-1767, p. 357.
 18. *Account Book-Letterbooks of Stephen Loyde, John Tayloe (1687-1747), and John Tayloe (1721-1779)*, 1717-1778.
 19. *Richmond County Deed Book 12*, 7 Oct. 1765, pp. 671-673; 17 Dec. 1767, pp. 820-821.
 20. *Richmond County Court Order Book 14*, 5 Oct. 1761, p. 470.
 21. *Richmond County Court Order Book 15*, 6 Aug. 1764, p. 294.
 22. *Ibid.*, 6 Sept. 1763, p. 178. "William Brockenbough and John Beale Gent. are appointed by the Court to View the Repairs and addition lately made to the prison by William Buckland and make Report thereof to the Next Court."
 23. *Ibid.*, 7 May 1764, p. 227.
 24. The exterior of Mount Airy, probably derived from plate 58 of James Gibbs' *A Book of Architecture* published in London in 1728 and 1739, was probably completed when Buckland arrived in Richmond County. For a

- discussion of possible design sources for Mount Airy see Thomas Tileston Waterman, *The Mansions of Virginia, 1706-1776* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1945), pp. 253-261.
25. John Tayloe to Landon Carter, 16 Oct. 1762, acc. 1959, tray 196 (RR), Manuscript Department, Alderman Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.
 26. *Account Book-Letterbooks of Stephen Loyde, John Tayloe (1687-1747), and John Tayloe (1721-1779), 1717-1778.*
 27. *Richmond County Court Order Book 15*, 6 July. 1763, p. 143.
 28. *Ibid.*, 4 Sept. 1764, p. 312.
 29. Thomas Tileston Waterman, *The Mansions of Virginia, 1706-1776* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1945), p. 259.
 30. *Memorandum Book of Robert Wormley Carter*, 6 Feb. 1766, Folder 19, Carter Family Papers, Manuscript Department, Earl Gregg Swem Library, The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.
 31. John Tayloe to Landon Carter, 3 Jan. 1768, Folder 2, Carter Family Papers, Manuscript Department, Earl Gregg Swem Library, The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.
 32. *Richmond County Deed Book 12*, 2 April 1765, p. 611. Richmond County indentures were occasionally recorded with deeds. These indentures were usually proven in court at a later date. John Randall's indenture was proven 6 May 1765 (*Richmond County Court Order Book 15*, 6 May 1765, p. 404).
 33. *Richmond County Deed Book 13*, 1 Aug. 1768, pp. 52-53. The indenture between Callis and Buckland was proven in Richmond County Court on 4 Aug. 1768 (*Richmond County Court Order Book 16*, 4 Aug. 1768, p. 426).
 34. Landon Carter, *The Diary of Colonel Landon Carter of Sabine Hall, 1752-1778*, Jack P. Greene, ed. (Charlottesville: The Virginia Historical Society, 1965), p. 328.
 35. *Richmond County Court Order Book 17*, 7 Aug. 1769, p. 20.
 36. *The Virginia Gazette*, 26 July 1770.
 37. *Ibid.*, 1 Aug. 1771.
 38. *Anne Arundel County Inventories, 1777*, Vol. 125, p. 337.
 39. Carter, *Diary of Landon Carter*. Vol. 1, p. 369.
 40. William Buckland to Robert Carter, 25 March 1771, Carter Family Papers, Mss/c2468/145-981, Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Va.
 41. The earliest reference to William Buckland working in Maryland is Nov. 1771, when he paid William Woodard £6:0:0 on account of Edward Lloyd IV. (Account between Edward Lloyd and James McCubbin, Nov. 1771, William Cooke Papers, Ms. 195, Maryland Historical Society.) Edward Lloyd had purchased Samuel Chase's unfinished house in July 1771 for £504 sterling and £2491:7:7 current Maryland money (James Bordley, Jr., "New Light on William Buckland," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, Vol. 46, June 1951, pp. 153-154). The tradesmen who went to Maryland with Buckland were John Ariss Callis, John Randall, Samuel Bailey, and, probably, Thomas Hall. John Ariss Callis of Maryland gave Richmond County lawyer Benjamin Branham power of attorney on 7 Dec. 1772 (*Richmond County Court Order*

- Book 17, p. 527). Both John Randall and Samuel Bailey appear in Buckland's inventory (*Anne Arundel County Inventories, 1777*, Vol. 125, p. 337). The London carver mentioned in Buckland's 25 March 1771 letter to Robert Carter was probably Thomas Hall. He ran away from Buckland in December 1773 (*The Maryland Gazette*, 16 Dec. 1773).
42. *Richmond County Deed Book 13*, 7 Nov. 1772.
 43. *Fairfax County Will Book C-1*, 1767-1776, p. 200. A detailed account of work done on Pohick Church is included in "The Estate of Mr. Daniel French Decd." (*Fairfax County Will Book C-1*, 1767-1776, pp. 168-175 and pp. 196-212 and *Fairfax County Will Book D-1*, 1776-1782, pp. 34-36). French agreed to build a church for the Vestry of Truro Parish for £870 "Current Money of Virginia" on 7 April 1769 (*Minutes of the Vestry of Truro Parish*, 7 April 1769, pp. 115-117); however, he died before Pohick Church was completed (*Ibid.*, 29 Nov. 1771, pp. 122-124).
 44. *Minutes of the Vestry of Truro Parish*, 7 April 1769, pp. 115-117.
 45. *Ibid.*, 8 July 1771, pp. 121-122.
 46. *Ibid.*, 5 June 1772, p. 125.
 47. *Fairfax County Will Book C-1*, 1767-1776, p. 200, 202, 204, 206, and 208.
 48. *Minutes of the Vestry of Truro Parish*, 25 Feb. 1774, pp. 134-136.
 49. *Ibid.*
 50. *Fairfax County Will Book C-1*, 1767-1776, p. 204.
 51. Plaskett, *Memories of a Plain Family*, p. 15.
 52. *Minutes of the Vestry of Truro Parish*, 7 April 1769, pp. 115-117; 5 June 1772, p. 125; and 25 Feb. 1774, pp. 134-136.
 53. *Ibid.*, 25 Feb. 1774, pp. 134-136.
 54. George Washington, *The Diaries of George Washington*, Donald Jackson, ed. (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1978), Vol. 3, p. 327 and 337.
 55. George Washington to Lund Washington, 20 August 1775 in *Tyler's Quarterly Magazine*, V. 7 (1926), pp. 245-247.
 56. William Bernard Sears and Goin Lanphier also worked together on Pohick Church (*Fairfax County Will Book C-1*, 1767-1776, pp. 196-212 and *Minutes of the Vestry of Truro Parish*, 25 Feb. 1774, pp. 134-136). Sears' daughter, Elizabeth (b. Fairfax County, 8 March 1774) married Goin Lanphier's son, Robert Goin Lanphier (May, *Descendants of Richard Saers*, p. 604).
 57. Lund Washington to George Washington, 29 Sept. 1775, photocopy on file at Mount Vernon, Mount Vernon, Va.
 58. *Ibid.*, 5 Oct. 1775.
 59. *Ibid.*, 5 Nov. 1775 and 12 Nov. 1775.
 60. *Ibid.*, 17 Dec. 1775.
 61. *Mount Vernon Ledger B, January 1775-October 27, 1784*, p. 144 and Typescript, *John Kirkpatrick-Lund Washington Cash and Plantation Account Book*, Cat. no. W-693, p. 51, Mount Vernon, Mount Vernon, Va.

For assistance with this article the author would like to thank Dr. Susan E. Sutton; Mr. Bennie J. Brown, Curator of Gunston Hall; Mr. Charles Phillips; Mr. and Mrs. H. Gwynne Tayloe, Jr.; Ms. Christine Meadows, Curator of Mount Vernon; Ms. Ellen McCallister, Librarian at Mount Vernon; Mr. John H. Rhodehamel, Archivist at Mount Vernon; MESDA's microfilm readers, and Peggy Scholley. Special thanks go to John Birns for many hours of instruction in the "Art and Mystery" of carving.



Figure 12. William Buckland by Charles Willson Peale, Annapolis, Maryland, 1787. Oil on canvas, sight dimensions 36 $\frac{1}{8}$ " x 26 $\frac{7}{8}$ ". MESDA research file S-10889. The portrait is in the Mabel Brady Garvan Collection at Yale University.

William Buckland Reconsidered: Architectural Carving in Chesapeake Maryland, 1771-1774

LUKE BECKERDITE

In the winter of 1771, William Buckland moved from Richmond County, Virginia, to Annapolis, Maryland, to design and supervise the construction of an unfinished house that Edward Lloyd IV purchased from Samuel Chase in July of the same year (Fig. 1).¹ The Chase-Lloyd House was one of at least fourteen townhouses built in Annapolis between 1764 and 1774. This was a decade of considerable prosperity based on increased consolidation of political power in the colonial capitol.² Buckland was fortunate in moving to Annapolis during this period of affluence and growth; however, his career there lasted only three years. In December, 1774, Buckland died at the age of forty.³ Although Buckland's residence in Maryland was brief, some aspect of architectural work on at least fifteen structures has been attributed to his shop.⁴ Several of these attributions were based on the unsupported assumption that Buckland worked in Maryland before 1771. This article will attempt to reassess Buckland's career from 1771-1774 through a comparative study of six houses, two documented and four previously attributed to his shop.

Documentary evidence suggests that William Buckland first traveled to Maryland in September, 1771. On 26 September he purchased "sundries" amounting to £7:14:8½ at the estate sale of Edward Lloyd III.⁵ Buckland apparently came to Annapolis at the request and expense of Edward Lloyd IV. In his ledger for 1770-1791, Lloyd recorded £3:10:0 spent "for self (Buckland) and Horse when I purchased New House."⁶ Lloyd's decision to commission Buckland may have been influenced by his wife, Elizabeth, whose father, John Tayloe of Mount Airy, had

bespoken work from Buckland's shop several years earlier.⁷ The exterior of Samuel Chase's house was nearing completion when it was purchased by Lloyd for £504:8:2 sterling and £2491:17:7 Maryland currency. The £2491:17:7 was for construction expenses incurred by Chase which are listed in his account as "Materials made usse [sic] of and Workmanship on Lott No. 107."⁸ Judging from this account, little interior work had been done before Lloyd hired Buckland in September.



Figure 1. Chase-Lloyd house, Annapolis, Maryland, 1769-1776. MESDA research file S-11416.

At least four of Buckland's Richmond County tradesmen followed him to Annapolis, possibly in November or December of 1771. John Randall, whom Buckland had taken as an apprentice in the joiner's and cabinetmaker's trade in 1765, had completed his indenture and attained journeyman status.⁹ Randall was one of the administrators of Buckland's estate, proven 3 June 1777.¹⁰ The inventory of Buckland's estate lists several tradesmen, including joiner Samuel Bailey,¹¹ a convict servant who had worked for Buckland in Richmond County. On 16 July 1771 he ran away, but was evidently apprehended and later taken to Annapolis.¹² Apparently, the "London Carver" whom Buckland

described as a “masterly Hand” in his 25 March 1771 letter to Robert Carter of Nomini Hall came to Maryland as well.¹³ On 16 December 1773 Buckland ran the following notification in the *Maryland Gazette*:

RAN away from the subscriber on Sunday last, a servant man, named Thomas Hall, a carver by trade: . . . The indenture he signed in London was given up to him and a discharge, after which he executed another indenture, by which he was to be allowed in consideration of his former service, wages after the rate of ten shillings per week till the time of his expiration, which would have been in September next . . .¹⁴



Figure 2. Venetian Window in the Chase-Lloyd house, 1771-1773, carving attributed to Thomas Hall. All of the Chase-Lloyd house carving illustrated is attributed to Hall. MESDA research file S-11416.

Evidence suggests that Hall was apprehended or returned to Buckland's service voluntarily and worked until his indenture expired. Buckland's apprentice John Ariss Callis also completed his indenture after moving to Maryland.¹⁵ On 7 November 1772

both Callis and Buckland granted power of attorney to Benjamin Branham of Richmond County.¹⁶ In Buckland's letter of attorney he refers to himself as a resident "of the City of Annapolis . . . Architect."¹⁷




Figure 3. Detail of the overlapping leaves and acorns of the pulvinated frieze of the Venetian Window illustrated in Figure 2.

Work probably began on Edward Lloyd's new house in November, 1771. During that month Buckland paid William Woodward £6:0:0, which was credited to Lloyd's account with James McCubbin and Michel Krips. From 24 November 1771 to 6 April 1772, Lloyd purchased 130,050 bricks valued at £140:0:0 from McCubbin's brickyard.¹⁸ Considering this transaction, Buckland's purchase of 44,425 eighteen-inch shingles in October, 1772 indicates that some type of exterior work was being done on Lloyd's house or adjacent dependencies.¹⁹

Buckland's tradesmen were probably involved with interior construction on the first two floors of the Chase-Lloyd house through April, 1773.²⁰ The first floor plan consists of a wide central hall flanked by two rooms on either side. A straight staircase rises from the center of the hall and continues to a landing at the back. In the rear wall above the first landing is a large "Venetian" window with a full entablature (Fig. 2). The pulvinated frieze of the entablature, which is carved with overlapping leaves with acorns (Fig. 3), may have been inspired by similar friezes illustrated in Abraham Swan's *British Architect*. However, this

was a common ornamental detail in the eighteenth century, and was illustrated in a number of architectural design books. The staircase divides at the landing and rises to the second floor. Supporting the second floor landing are two ionic columns in the center of the hall, and two ionic pilasters, one on each wall of the hallway. The columns and pilasters are connected by a full entablature running the width of the hall.



Figure 4. Dining room door with gadrooned surround and full entablature, Chase-Lloyd house, 1771-1773. MESDA research file S-11416.

Edward Lloyd's ledger for 1770-1791 documents work done by Buckland's shop in the dining room and "little rooms" of the first and second floors. On 26 April 1773 Buckland was credited with the purchase of various materials, workman's wages, and carving:

By workmen's wages Pr. Acco. from	
12th October 1772 to 2nd Novr. 1772	33:5:0
By Carving the chimney piece	
in the little room below	3:10:0
By ditto ditto ditto above	2:10:0
By ditto in the room over the dining room .	3:0:0
By ditto the cornice over the rear door	1:10:0
By workman's wages getting ready &	
puttg up the work in the dining room	72:9:10½
By carving in the dining room as Pr. Account	62:0:6
By 1 Month and 20 days wages from the	
30th August 1773 till the 10th November	
following at 60 Sterlg. 66⅔ Pct.	13:17:9 ²¹



Figure 5. Entablature of a door in the Chase-Lloyd house dining room showing applied carving on the frieze between the consoles, 1771-1773. MESDA research file S-11416.




Figure 6. Detail of a stair bracket illustrated in plate 39 of Abraham Swan's *British Architect*, London, 1758. The book was first published in London in 1745 (*Helen Park, A List of Architectural Books Available in America Before the Revolution* [Los Angeles: Hennessey & Ingalls, Inc., 1961, rep. ed. 1973], pp. 71-72).

Included in the materials listed on the debit side of this account were 2¼ gallons of linseed oil possibly used in painting the carving, hair, and “500 pounds stucco borrowed of Mr. Paca.” The hair and stucco may have been used for plastering the dining room, since the reference to stucco follows an entry for “sundry materials in the dining room Pr. Account.”²²



Figure 7. Dining room window in the Chase-Lloyd house showing gadrooned surround, carved flower set into a panel in the upper window reveal, and carved garlands applied in recessed panels below the window molding volutes, 1771-1773. MESDA research file S-11416.

The dining room is the largest and most elaborate room in the Chase-Lloyd house. It has three mahogany doors with gadrooned surrounds and full entablatures, further ornamented with carved consoles and pitched pediments (Fig. 4). The frieze of each entablature has flanking pairs of carved bird heads that change to acanthus leafage as they flow away from the sheaf of leaves in the center (Fig. 5). The design of these bird heads may have been derived from plate 39 of Swan's *British Architect* (Fig. 6), or plate 42 of his *Collection of Designs in Architecture*.²³

The four dining room windows also have gadrooned surrounds and upper reveals and concealed shutters with recessed panels containing carved flowers (Fig. 7). Below the volutes at the bases of the window architraves are recessed, molded panels with carved garlands (Fig. 8). As Edward Lloyd's ledger entries show, Buckland's carver spent most of his time working on ornaments for the dining room. The £62:0:6 value placed on this carving represents slightly over one hundred seventy-seven days' work, assuming that a tradesman was paid seven shillings per day.²⁴ This is not an unrealistic estimate of the time required to complete the dining room carving, especially if an apprentice assisted with the moldings and rough work.



Figure 8. Detail of a garland illustrated in Figure 7.

A technical examination of the carving in the Chase-Lloyd house is complicated by the accumulation of several layers of paint, which distort the cuts used in delineating and modelling the carved elements. However, the modelling of the door frieze acanthus is distinctive. Each lobe is sharply defined and modelled with a single wide flute rather than being fluted and then veined with smaller flutes (Fig. 9). Even the curled tips of the acanthus leaves are fluted only on their upper edges. Vertical cuts with a lightly-radiused gouge were used to delineate the acanthus leaves with pointed tips, while a sharply-radiused gouge was employed

for the rounded lobes. The pointed lobes have concave surfaces modelled with a flute that stops short of the end, and a horizontal gouge cut made across the tip, perpendicular to the flow of the leaf. This perpendicular flute causes the upper surface of the leaf end to dip, then rise slightly at the tip. An interesting parallel with Buckland's Virginia style can be observed in the small, circular fret between the bead-and-reel and rope molding above the door frieze (Figs. 5, 9). Buckland used this fret over the drawing room door and windows at Gunston Hall and on the front rail of a sideboard table, probably owned by John Tayloe of Mount Airy.²⁵



Figure 9. Detail of carved ornament applied on the frieze of the door illustrated in Figure 5.

Carving on the chimney piece in the small room left of the central hall at the back of the Chase-Lloyd house (Fig. 10) corresponds with Edward Lloyd's ledger entry: "By Carving the Chimney piece in the little room below."²⁶ The £3:10:0 charged for the carving amounts to 10 days' work computed at seven shillings per day. Although much of the detail is obscured by paint, the mantlepiece garlands (Fig. 11) compare favorably with the garlands set in the recessed panels below the volutes of the window surround. (Fig. 8). This is especially true of the flutes used in modelling the ribbons. The carving in the Chase-Lloyd house is attributed to Thomas Hall, the only carver known to have worked for Buckland on Lloyd's commission. Considering the importance of Lloyd's patronage, it is only logical that Buckland would have put his finest hand to work on the carving.

Although Buckland's shop was involved with interior construction and carving until April, 1773, work on Edward Lloyd's house came under the direction of William Noke in November, 1772. Under the ledger heading "William Noke for New House

in Annapolis,” Lloyd credited Noke for wages and materials purchased through 16 January 1776. Included among these was an entry for “Cash paid Rawlings and Barnes at sundry times” which amounted to £208:9:9.²⁷ John Rawlings and James Barnes were London plasterers and stucco workers. On 30 January 1771 they advertised that the firm was “late from London” and would supply gentlemen with “Designs for cielings and Cornices on the shortest Notice.”²⁸



Figure 10. Chimney piece in the small northwest room of the Chase-Lloyd house, 1771-1773. MESDA research file S-11416.



Figure 11. Detail of the garland on the central panel of the chimney piece illustrated in Figure 10.

Judging from Buckland's advertisements for runaway servants, his workforce grew considerably after his arrival in Annapolis. In September, 1773, bricklayer Thomas Hoskins ran away, possibly to join his brother in Philadelphia,²⁹ and in November plasterer Richard Sadler and bricklayers John Fogarty and Charles Sawyer excused themselves from Buckland's service without leave to do so.³⁰ On 17 March 1774 Buckland offered £5 reward for joiner Thomas M'Inerhency who was "known to be an Irishman by his talk."³¹ In April, 1774, Richard Sadler ran away again, along with the joiner, Croasdale Sprotson, and a plasterer by the name of John Wakefield.³²



Figure 13. Detail of Peale's portrait of Buckland showing elevation and floor plan of the Hammond house.

Unlike Buckland's previous work in Virginia and Maryland, the commission he undertook for Mathias Hammond in Annapolis involved furnishing both interior and exterior elevations of an academic dwelling. On 31 March 1774, Hammond purchased two lots from his brother Denton; the lots were directly in front of Edward Lloyd's house and joined a tract of land he purchased earlier.³³ Although construction may have begun in April, Buckland's death in December prevented him from seeing its completion. Documentation proving that Buckland designed Mathias Hammond's house is found in the final account of Buckland's estate, and also in his portrait, finished by Charles Willson Peale on 7 April 1787 (Fig. 12, p. 42).³⁴ Peale may have begun the portrait before Buckland's death, completing it in 1787, or he may have worked from a portrait painted at an earlier date. In either case, Peale's portrait shows Buckland seated at a table working on exterior elevations and floor plans of Hammond's dwelling, known today as the Hammond-Harwood house (Fig.

13). Despite Buckland's untimely death, the Hammond house was completed as drawn (Fig. 14) and evidence indicates that Thomas Hall did virtually all of the carving on the first floor. If Buckland signed a formal agreement with Hammond, the contract may have been executed by his estate. One of the executors of the estate, John Randall, had worked with Buckland since 1765 and could have easily taken over direction of the construction. This theory is supported by the final audit of



Figure 14. *The Hammond house, Annapolis, Maryland, 1774-1778. MESDA research file S-11412.*

Buckland's estate, which lists £96:17:6 ". . . gained on finishing Mr. Hammonds House," which is too large a sum for architectural drawings alone.³⁵ Another possible explanation is that Buckland's contract with Hammond was purchased and executed by another "undertaker." Six servants from Buckland's estate, including a carver, painter, carpenter, stone mason, and two bricklayers, were advertised in the 15 December 1774 *Maryland Gazette*.³⁶ Buckland's inventory, taken 19 december 1774, listed "Thomas Waits a Servant and Bricklayer, John Trutton ditto, ditto., Samuel Bailey a Carpenter and Joiner, Michael Burke a Painter, [and] James Reynolds a Carver . . ."³⁷ If Buckland's contract was purchased, the undertaker completing the work could have acquired tradesmen at his estate sale.



Figure 15. Door with carved consoles and moldings, full entablature, and applied frieze carving in the large southeast room on the first floor of the Hammond house. Unless noted, all carving in the Hammond house is attributed to Thomas Hall. MESDA research file S-11412.



Figure 16. Detail of the applied carving on the door frieze illustrated in Figure 15.

Most of the architectural carving in the Hammond house adorns the large, southeast room on the first floor. The room has three windows and three doors, all having full entablatures with carved consoles and moldings (Fig. 15). Like the work in the Lloyd

house (Figs. 5, 9), the frieze of each entablature is decorated with pairs of carved bird heads that change to acanthus, flanking a central sheath of leaves (Fig. 16). The basic format of these details is repeated on the chimney piece (Fig. 17); however, the central ornament is a Neoclassical urn, and the acanthus is more elaborate (Fig. 18). The crosssetted frame of the overmantle has stylized



Figure 17. Chimney piece in the southeast room on the first floor of the Hammond house. MESDA research file S-11412.

acanthus applied on the fascia below a bead-and-reel astragal, and is surmounted by a broken-scroll pediment formed by opposing C-scrolls and leafy volutes. An additional parallel with work in the Chase-Lloyd house can be observed in the window reveals and shutters, which have recessed panels with carved moldings and flowers (Fig. 19). However, this stylistic detail is not unique to Buckland's work. The leaves of these flowers were carved separately and attached to each panel with small wrought finishing nails.



Figure 18. Detail of the applied carving on the frieze of the chimney piece illustrated in Figure 17.




Figure 19. Detail of one of the flowers set into the panel of a window reveal in the first floor southeast room of the Hammond house. MESDA research file S-11412.

The carving in the Hammond house is attributed to Thomas Hall, based upon several stylistic and technical parallels with work in the Chase-Lloyd house. The door frieze acanthus in both houses is composed of long, clearly defined lobes, modelled with a single

wide flute (Figs. 9, 16). In Hammond's house, this technique of modelling can also be observed in the pediment acanthus (Fig. 20), shutter and window casing flowers (Fig. 19), and in the acanthus of the consoles and frieze of the chimney piece (Figs. 21, 22). The curled tips of the leaves also have a fluted upper edge, a detail noted on the door frieze carving in the Chase-Lloyd house (Fig. 9). The shaping of the lobe ends of the leafage in the Hammond house is consistent with the carving in the Chase-



Figure 20. Detail of the acanthus applied to the tympanum of the over-mantel pediment illustrated in Figure 17.

Lloyd house. The round lobe ends (Figs. 16, 22) were formed by vertical cuts with sharply-radiused gouges of various widths. The size of the tool depended upon the shape of the lobe after the rough outline of the leaf had been cut with a bow saw fitted with a very thin blade. Saw kerfs are still visible between several of the acanthus lobes in Figs. 16 and 19. The delineation of the individual lobes was accomplished by making two vertical cuts with a medium or lightly-radiused gouge following a saw cut, or with two gouge cuts alone. As seen in the door and window console acanthus, vertical cuts with a medium-radiused gouge were used to form the ends of pointed acanthus lobes (Fig. 23). The ends of the four upper leaves of the console acanthus also had a horizontal gouge cut made across the tip of the leaf, perpendicular to the flow. This technique was also observed in the modelling of the Chase-Lloyd house acanthus (Fig. 9). The deep

central veins of the console leaves appear to have been made with a parting tool, possibly one having a slightly rounded bottom. Comparison of the bird heads in the Chase-Lloyd house dining room with those in the Hammond house shows slight variation in form, but a similar approach and techniques in modelling the eyes, feathers, and beaks (Figs. 9, 16). The upper eyelid was formed by two cuts with a lightly-radiused gouge. The cut used to shape the back section of the upper eyelid was made with the convex side of the blade facing up, while the lid over the eye was formed with the concave side up. In both houses the birds' feathers were modelled with flutes made with a very small gouge.



Figure 21. Detail of one of the relief carved consoles of the chimney piece illustrated in Figure 17.



Figure 22. Detail of acanthus carving on the frieze of the chimney piece illustrated in Figure 17.



Figure 23. Detail of one of the relief carved consoles of the door entablature illustrated in Figure 15.




Figure 24. Chimney piece in the second floor southeast room of the Hammond house. MESDA research file S-11412. Carving possibly by James Reynolds.



Figure 25. Detail of one of the spandrel garlands over the front door of the Hammond house. MESDA research file S-11412.



Figure 26. Detail of carved moldings and garlands applied to the frieze of the chimney piece illustrated in Figure 24.

While most of the work on the first floor of the Hammond house is characteristic of carving attributed to Hall, the carving on the chimney piece in the large southeast room on the second floor is by another hand (Fig. 24). The applique garlands on the spandrels of the front door are attributed to Hall (Fig. 25). Several of the flowers have petals modelled with a single gouge cut without veining, and are related in form to flowers on the central panel of the chimney piece in Fig. 11. Unfortunately, the buildup of paint on the chimney piece makes comparison difficult. The

leaves of the door spandrel carving have serrated edges and the larger ones are modelled with parallel flutes, unlike the chimney piece leaves which, for the most part, have plain edges and are modelled only with a flute down the center. Parallel flutes with a small gouge were used to model the ribbons of the door spandrel garlands, unlike the heavy-handed treatment of the chimney piece ribbons. Moreover, the spandrel ribbons have undercut areas which produce a naturalistic flow not seen in Figs. 24 and 26. Despite these differences, certain details such as the veining of the flower in the far right of Fig. 24 and the basic form of the flowers suggests a possible relationship. Buckland's estate inventory listed "James Reynolds a Carver," and it is possible that he executed this carving after Thomas Hall's indenture expired.³⁸

Buckland's death in December, 1774 brings to question his role in the design of the carving in Mathias Hammond's house. With the exception of structural joinery, interior construction and the installation of decorative details usually followed the roofing of a house. Assuming that work on Hammond's house could not have started before April, 1774, it is highly doubtful that the exterior walls had been completed before Buckland's death. Had Buckland failed to draw the carving before his death, the ornaments could have been designed by John Randall or Thomas Hall.




Figure 27. William Paca house, Annapolis, Maryland, 1763-1765. MESDA research file S-11415.

Ultimately, it was the carver who interpreted the drawings, regardless of whether they were detailed drafts or rudimentary sketches. Thomas Hall's unique personal style suggests that he was responsible for part of the design as well as the execution of the carving in the Lloyd and Hammond houses. The carving in the Hammond house leans more towards Neoclassical detail than work in the Chase-Lloyd house. This is apparent in the fluted cove molding of the window and door entablatures and scale and flow of the frieze and console carving (Figs. 15, 16). Hall almost certainly would have been exposed to Neoclassical ornament and styles of carving through his training and work in London during the 1760s.



Figure 28. Detail of one of the flowers set into the panel of a window reveal in the first floor parlor of the Paca house. MESDA research file S-11415.

In addition to architectural work, Buckland's Annapolis shop produced furniture. On 26 March 1774, Buckland received £16:12:6 from the commissioners of the loan office for "one Large Double Desk Covered with green Cloth, Locks, hinges, brasses, &c . . . repairing one large Table finding 3 doz. of Screws & one pr. of hinges."³⁹ Further indications of furniture production can be found in Buckland's estate inventory which lists 46 pounds of glue, "1 large white Picture frame, 2 ditto. blacked, 5 Table frames @ 4/ Each . . . 12 Books Gold Leaf & Damaged," and a small, unfinished picture frame.⁴⁰

Buckland appears to have supplied plans and elevations for two other structures during his residence in Annapolis. On 3 November 1774, the trustees "for building a court-house and

prison in Caroline County” gave notice that they would “agree with workmen to execute the same [the court house and prison], agreeable to plans and elevations that . . . may be seen . . . by applying to William Buckland in Annapolis.”⁴¹ Buckland was also paid £25 for “expenses and services relative to the Public Building . . .” in Annapolis, and it has been speculated that the payment was for interior plans of the State House Senate Chamber.⁴² However, this would appear to be an excessive amount for drawings alone. As a contrasting example, Buckland charged Robert Wormley Carter £1:1:6 in 1766 for “a Plan of a House . . . he drew some time agoe.”⁴³ Buckland’s annual salary for work on Edward Lloyd’s house was £60 sterling.⁴⁴ From November, 1771 to December, 1774, the exchange rate for pounds sterling to Maryland currency fluctuated between a low of 1 to 1.55 and a high of 1 to 1.70.⁴⁵ At these exchange rates, Buckland’s weekly salary could have ranged from roughly £1:18 to £2:6 Maryland currency per week. The £25 paid Buckland



Figure 29. Chimney piece in the first floor parlor of the Paca house. MESDA research file S-11415. The plaster overmantle is a conjectural restoration based on surviving evidence of the original outline of the design (Russell J. Wright, "The Restoration of the William Paca House," The Magazine Antiques, Vol. 111, January 1977, p. 164).

would have amounted to 13 to 19 weeks' work. In the eighteenth century, architectural plans and elevations were not nearly as detailed as they would be today, and a draft of the Senate Chamber should have taken no more than a week. This suggests that Buckland's workmen were also involved in some aspect of construction. Family tradition maintains that John Randall directed work on the Senate Chamber after Buckland's death.⁴⁶




Figure 30. Detail of the frieze carving of the chimney piece illustrated in Figure 29.



Figure 31. Detail of overlapping leaves carved on the pulvinated frieze of the chimney piece in the first floor southwest room of the Hammond house. MESDA research file S-11412.

Interior work in William Paca's house (Fig. 27), built between 1763 and 1765, has been attributed to William Buckland based on certain stylistic details and a 26 April credit entry in Edward Lloyd's ledger for 500 pounds of stucco that Buckland borrowed from Paca.⁴⁷ Although this ledger account suggests that plastering or stucco work was being done in Paca's house between November, 1771 and April 1773, there is absolutely no indication that Buckland or his workmen were involved. This is borne out by examination of the carving in the first floor parlor. The window reveals in that room have recessed panels with carved molded edges and applied flowers, a stylistic feature noted in

the Chase-Lloyd house dining room and the large southeast room of the Hammond house. However, there are basic differences in the delineation and modelling of the flowers. The leaf edges of Fig. 28 were formed by vertical cuts with a lightly-radiused gouge. Unlike Hall-attributed carving, the lobes of these flowers are not clearly defined, and are modelled with two or three tiny flutes per lobe, rather than a single wide flute. The design of the chimney piece in the parlor (Fig. 29) was taken from plate 61 of the 1741 edition of Batty Langley's *City and Country Builder's and Workman's Treasury of Designs*.⁴⁸ The overlapping oak leaves carved on the pulvinated frieze of the chimney piece are relatively flat, and are irregularly veined with a very small gouge (Fig. 30). This differs significantly from the carving on the pulvinated frieze of the Venetian window in the Chase-Lloyd house (Fig. 3) and the chimney piece in the southwest room of the Hammond house (Fig. 31). In these examples, the leaves are more three-dimensional with convex and concave surfaces modelled with deep flutes. Small parallel flutes are used to vein the chimney piece leaves.



Figure 32. James Brice house, Annapolis, Maryland, 1767-1775. MESDA research file S-11401.

Architectural carving in the James Brice house (Fig. 32) presents an even greater contrast to work attributed to Buckland's shop. John Brice, James Brice's father, died in 1766, leaving his

son land in Cecil and Kent Counties and two town lots in Annapolis with building materials “for the purpose of building a dwelling house and out houses.”⁴⁹ Work began on Brice’s house in 1767, four years before Buckland arrived in Annapolis. Although construction continued through 1774, James Brice’s ledger, which records the “Cost of Erecting Buildings on Lotts in Annaps.,” fails to mention Buckland or any of his known tradesmen.⁵⁰ The only carver identified in the ledger is William Bampton, who was credited £40:0:1 “By finishing largest Room in my House the Carpenters and Joiners work &. carving Chimney Piece.”⁵¹ However, the carving in the Brice house is the product of four hands.




Figure 33. Chimney piece in the first floor northeast room of the Brice house, 1769-1772, carving attributed to William Bampton. MESDA research file S-11401.

Plates 50 and 51 of Swan’s *British Architect* directed the design of the ornamental consoles in the northeast (Fig. 33) and northwest (Fig. 34) rooms on the first floor of the Brice house. In terms of execution, the carving is very naive. The acanthus leaves of both consoles were modelled with wide flutes made with a relatively large gouge, then veined with a small gouge (Fig. 35). The carver’s heavy-handed use of the gouge produced deep, concave

surfaces with high ridges separating the acanthus lobes (Fig. 35). Elements of the formula used in delineating the acanthus leaves of the ornamental consoles are repeated on the console illustrated in Fig. 36 and the stair bracket acanthus (Fig. 37). Although executed more successfully, the same basic modelling techniques are employed on the stair brackets and console acanthus (Figs. 36, 37).



Figure 34. One of the ornamental consoles flanking the architraves of the chimney piece in the northwest room of the Brice house, carving attributed to William Bampton. MESDA research file S-11401.

Attribution of this work to William Bampton is supported by James Brice's ledger entry crediting him for carving the chimney piece in the northeast or "largest Room" of the house. Under the ledger heading "Carver," Brice recorded £9:15:0 for chimney pieces and £8:1:0 for twenty-three stair brackets.⁵² Assuming that this was full payment for all of the carving on both chimney pieces and the stair brackets, the brackets required almost 27 days, and the chimney pieces 32½ days. This computation is based on a daily salary of six shillings.⁵³

The chimney piece in the southwest room (Fig. 38), and possibly the molding of the lower section of the chimney piece



Figure 35. Detail of the ornamental console illustrated in Figure 34.

in the northeast room (Fig. 36), represents the work of another hand. Greater emphasis is placed on veining, and the leaves have flat rather than concave surfaces. Though much more naive, this carving is stylistically related to work attributed to William Bampton. The ornamental consoles in Fig. 39 have a stippled background like the stair brackets and the acanthus lobes show considerable overlapping and deep veining. One possible explanation for this relationship is that Bampton's work was copied by another hand. In 1771 Brice paid George Forster, a joiner, for "making Chimney piece in dining Room, altering Chimney piece in Parlour & making Chimney pc. up Stairs."⁵⁴ The only chimney piece in the Brice house that shows evidence of alteration is that in the northeast or "largest Room." A definite lack of architectural understanding is present in the mounting of the shelf consoles illustrated in Fig. 36. Rather than resting on top of the crosstetted corners of the fireplace architrave, they are suspended awkwardly above the ornamental consoles. The carving on this molding is much more naive than the moldings on the overmantle

of the chimney piece attributed to Bampton (Fig. 40). The deep veining of the flowers used on the molding (Fig. 36) shows a closer relationship to the ornamental consoles in the southwest room, especially the flower in the upper left of Fig. 39. The applied carving on the frieze of the chimney piece in the northeast room represents the work of two other hands, both of which may be the work of twentieth century carvers. Although the central shell is original, and possibly the work of William Bampton, the flanking leafage that mimics Philadelphia-style drawer carving was added much later. Beirne and Scharff's monograph *William Buckland, 1734-1774*, published in 1958, illustrates this chimney piece with only the lower scrolls of the acanthus present.⁵⁵ The applied carving flanking the central shell is extremely flat, and the incised work in the center is atypical of eighteenth century carving. The rusticated inner edges of the two lower C-scrolls may have been inspired by the C-scrolls in the center of the shelf consoles; however, the flow and modelling of the applique work is inferior to other work in the Brice house.



Figure 36. One of the shelf consoles of the chimney piece in the first floor north-west room of the Brice house, carving attributed to William Bampton. MESDA research file S-11401.



Figure 37. Mahogany stair bracket in the Brice house foyer, carving attributed to William Bampton. MESDA research file S-11401.



Figure 38. Chimney piece in the first floor southwest room of the Brice house, carving possibly by George Forster, 1769-1772. MESDA research file S-11401.

Architectural carving in the large southeast room of Thomas Ringgold's house in Chestertown, Kent County, Maryland has also been attributed to William Buckland (Figs. 41, 48). This attribution was based on the style of the carved ornaments and the incised inscription "WB 1771," which was found on one of the panelling framing boards after the woodwork was purchased

by the Baltimore Museum of Art in 1932.⁵⁶ In 1767, merchant Thomas Ringgold purchased two houses in Chestertown between Water Street and Canon Street, then built a connecting structure soon afterwards.⁵⁷ Judging from the 1771 inscription, Ringgold also commissioned some remodelling of the older structures.



Figure 39. Detail of one of the ornamental consoles flanking the architraves of the chimney piece illustrated in Figure 38.



Figure 40. Detail of the architrave moldings on the overmantle in the first floor northwest room of the Brice house, carving attributed to William Bampton. MESDA research file S-11401.



Figure 41. Chimney piece from the southeast room of the Thomas Ringgold house in Chestertown, carving executed 1771-1775. MESDA research file S-11379. This room is installed in the Baltimore Museum of Art.

Evidence now indicates that the carved ornaments were imported from Philadelphia, and represent the same hand that executed most of the carving in the Winterthur Museum's Stamper-Blackwell Parlor. The upper section of the Ringgold chimney piece has a crosssetted frame surmounted by a full entablature with a pitched pediment (Fig. 41). Carved flowers

are set into each corner of the frame, and the frieze of the entablature has a central panel carved with a naturalistic scene (Fig. 42) flanked by acanthus leafage (Fig. 43). On either side



Figure 42. Carved central panel of the overmantle frieze of the chimney piece illustrated in Figure 41.



Figure 43. Acanthus appliques flanking the central panel on the overmantle frieze of the chimney piece illustrated in Figure 41.

of the crossetted frame are naturalistic garlands (Figs. 44, 45) suspended below a ruffled bow. These compare favorably with the garlands flanking the chimney piece in the Stamper-Blackwell Parlor (Fig. 46). The leaves were shaped with the same formula of gouge cuts (Figs. 45, 46), and their modelling is virtually identical. Both examples show considerable use of perpendicular shading cuts on overturned leaves, prominent central veins, and full surface articulation. Similar techniques were also used to model the flower at the top of Fig. 45 and the large flower in Fig. 46. This is especially evident in the delineation of the petals and the veining of the concave and convex surfaces. Further comparisons can be made between the flowers on the Ringgold house garlands and those on the central panel of the Stamper-Blackwell chimney piece (Fig. 47). Although obscured by paint, the modelling of the house, tree, and clouds on this panel is similar to several of the carved elements in Fig. 42.

The doors from the southeast room of the Ringgold house also have full entablatures with carved consoles and appliques in both the crossetted architraves and the friezes (Fig. 48). Like the acanthus on the chimney piece entablature (Fig. 43), the door




Figure 44. Carved garland mounted on the wall to the right of the chimney piece illustrated in Figure 41.

frieze leafage (Fig. 49) shows considerable twisting and overlapping of the leaf ends. The voluted ends of several of these acanthus leaves have two or three trailing lobes which are fluted like the scroll ends on the central panel of the chimney piece in the Stamper-Blackwell Parlor (Fig. 47). Acanthus flows from the lower corners of this panel and becomes intertwined with the two large C-scrolls forming the lower border of the central scene. This intertwining is stylistically related to the scroll treatment of entablature appliques (Fig. 43). The central element at the top of the Stamper-Blackwell panel also has voluted ends that rise in the center. This detail is repeated on the central panel of the chimney piece entablature from the Ringgold house. The work of the same hand is also apparent in the delineation and modelling of the door consoles (Figs. 50, 51). Both have acanthus with high concave surfaces that appear to be articulated with chip cuts.



Figure 45. Detail of the garland illustrated in Figure 44.

Although the design of these consoles differ, the modelling is nearly identical on corresponding elements. This is evident in the fluting and shaping of the large leaves that flow away from the central vein just above the console scrolls of Figs. 50 and 51. These veins also have a deep parting tool cut at the top.

The occurrence of Philadelphia carving on Maryland's Eastern Shore should come as no surprise, considering the commercial and family ties that existed between the two areas.⁵⁸ For example, Thomas Ringgold transacted business with John Cadwalader⁵⁹ and patronized Philadelphia's cabinetmaker Benjamin Randolph. Recorded in Randolph's account book is a 5 August 1771 debit entry under Ringgold's name "To Shop £23:6:6d."⁶⁰ In light of this account and Randolph's known employment of carvers Hercules Courtenay and John Pollard,⁶¹ it is possible that the Ringgold house carving was executed in Randolph's shop, then shipped to Chestertown by boat or overland. However, this is only speculation. Attribution of this work to a specific shop or hand will depend on a more thorough study of Philadelphia carving.



Figure 46. Detail of one of the carved garlands flanking the overmantle in the Winterthur Museum's Stamper-Blackwell Parlour. Courtesy The Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum.




Figure 47. Central panel of the chimney piece in the Stamper-Blackwell Parlour. Courtesy The Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum.



Figure 48. Detail of a door entablature from the Ringgold house parlor. MESDA research file S-11379.



Figure 49. Detail showing the acanthus of the door frieze applique illustrated in Figure 48.



Figure 50. Detail of the relief carved acanthus on the door consoles illustrated in Figure 48.



Figure 51. Entablature of a door in the Stamper-Blackwell Parlor. Courtesy The Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum.



Figure 52. *Cloverfields, Queen Anne's County, Maryland, 1730-1740. MESDA research file S-9444.*

Examination of the carving in William Hemsley's house, *Cloverfields* (Figs. 52, 53), reveals a similar pattern of patronage. Hemsley patented 1622 acres of land in Queen Anne's County, Maryland on 10 October 1726. This tract of land was made up of six smaller tracts purchased by William's father, Philemen Hemsley. Philemen left the land to William in his will of 1 April 1719. William's son, Philemen, inherited the land and probably the house, but died shortly afterwards. In his will of 20 July 1750, Philemen bequeathed *Cloverfields* to his brother William.⁶² It was this William Hemsley who owned the house when the carving illustrated in Fig. 53 was installed.

The central hunting scene in the applique above the fireplace architrave (Fig. 54) was inspired by plate 5 of Thomas Johnson's *One Hundred and Fifty New Designs* published in London in 1761.⁶³ The appearance of this book in Buckland's estate inventory⁶⁴ and the style of the *Cloverfields* carving formed the basis of recent attributions of this work to his hand. Although the *Cloverfields* carving is in the Rococo style like a majority of the work attributed to Buckland's Annapolis shop, the execution of the carving is noticeably different. Architectural carving in *Cloverfields* is attributed by the author to the Philadelphia carver James Reynolds, based on several stylistic similarities with a carved

looking glass in the Winterthur Collection (Fig. 55). This looking glass was made for John Cadwalader and is documented by James Reynolds' 5 December 1770 bill receipt listing "a Pier glass 36:19 hd: 13 pier gold."⁶⁵



Figure 53. Chimney piece in the first floor parlor or dining room of Cloverfields, carving attributed to the Philadelphia carver James Reynolds. Reynolds was probably working in Philadelphia by November, 1766 (Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia: Three Centuries of American Art. [Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1976] p. 119).



Figure 54. Detail of the applied carving above the architrave of the chimney piece illustrated in Figure 53.



Figure 55. Looking Glass attributed to James Reynolds, Philadelphia, 1771, pine and poplar. HOA: 55½, W'OA: 28¼. W'interthur acc. no. 52.261. Courtesy The Henry Francis duPont W'interthur Museum.

The gouge cuts used in delineating the leaves below the console flowers illustrated in Fig. 56 correspond to the formula used in forming the edges of the leaves trailing down either side of

the Reynolds looking glass (Fig. 57). This is especially evident in the carver's use of two medium-radiused gouge cuts to form the ends of pointed leaves. Like the Philadelphia carving in the Ringgold house, Reynolds' work shows extensive use of shading cuts.



Figure 56. Detail of the ornamental console to the left of the chimney piece in Figure 53.

Both the console and looking glass leaves have fully articulated surfaces veined with a small gouge. As seen in the chimney piece garlands (Fig. 58), consoles (Fig. 56), and looking glass (Fig. 57), leaves attributed to Reynolds lack the prominent central vein noted in the Ringgold house carving. The flowers set into the crossetted corners of the chimney piece (Fig. 59) also have fully veined surfaces. The design of these flowers appears to have been inspired by plate 4 of Swan's *British Architect*. Except for the leaf tips, similar techniques were used to form the acanthus on either side of the voluted leaves in Fig. 56 and the acanthus just above the looking glass in the center of Fig. 55. The treatment of the "leafy scrolls" of the looking glass also compares favorably with the for-



Figure 57. Detail of the looking glass illustrated in Figure 55.



Figure 58. Applique garland to the left of the chimney piece illustrated in Figure 53.

mation and veining of the leaves that lap over the center of the flowers in Cloverfields (Fig. 59).

William Hemsley's correspondence in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania shows personal and financial ties with Philadelphia. Like Thomas Ringgold, Hemsley also patronized Philadelphia tradesmen. Evidently, he commissioned work from both James Reynolds and Benjamin Randolph. On 6 June 1769, Randolph credited "William Helmsley of Queen Anne's County Maryland" for payment of £18:2s for "Sundry Accompts."⁶⁶



Figure 59. Carved flower set into one of the crosssetted corners of the overmantle of the chimney piece illustrated in Figure 53.

Contemporary views of eighteenth century trades are too often concerned solely with the overall visual appearance of an object rather than the techniques required to produce it. This paramount emphasis on style has in the past obscured the diversity of architectural carving in Chesapeake Maryland and greatly over-emphasized the influence of William Buckland. The carving examined in this article represents the work of several different hands, each having a unique personal style. This individualism is evident in the design as well as the execution of the carving. Professional draftsmen like Buckland no doubt influenced the basic form and placement of carved details in some instances; however, it was the carver that ultimately interpreted such designs.

Mr. Beckerdite is Research Associate at MESDA.

FOOTNOTES

1. James Bordley, Jr., "New Light on William Buckland," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, Vol. 46, June 1951, pp. 153-154.
2. Edward C. Papenfuse, *In Pursuit of Profit: The Annapolis Merchants in the Era of the American Revolution, 1763-1805* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975), pp. 16-17.
3. On the back of his indenture to Thomson Mason, William Buckland recorded that he was born on 14 August 1734 (Indenture between William Buckland and Thomson Mason, 4 August 1755, George Mason Papers, Gunston Hall Archives, Gunston Hall Plantation, Lorton, Virginia). Buckland died in December 1774 (*Anne Arundel County Inventories, 1777*, Vol. 125, p. 337).
4. Rosamond Randall Beirne and John Henry Scharff attributed work on the following structures to William Buckland: the Chase-Lloyd house, Upton Scott house, John Ridout house, Strawberry Hill, Paca house, Brice house, Montpelier, Ringgold house, Tulip Hill, White Hall, the Senate Chamber of the State House, Mathias Hammond's house and the Court House in Caroline County (Rosamond Randall Beirne and John Henry Scharff, *William Buckland, 1734-1774: Architect of Virginia and Maryland* [Baltimore: The Maryland Historical Society, 1958], pp. 55-132). Six of these structures will be covered in this article. Tulip Hill, the Annapolis houses of John Ridout and Upton Scott, and Governor Horatio Sharpe's Whitehall were extensively photographed and studied by the author but are omitted due to the limited scope of this article. The execution of the carving in all of these houses differs considerably from work attributed to Buckland's known carvers, William Bernard Sears and Thomas Hall; however, the carving in the Ridout house and Whitehall are by the same hand. Attributions of these houses to Buckland were based on the unsupported assumption that he worked in Maryland before 1771. The Adams-Kilty house was attributed to Buckland by William Voss Elder, III (William Voss Elder, III, "The Adams-Kilty House in Annapolis," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, Vol. 60, September, 1965, pp. 314-324). This house does not contain any architectural carving. William Hemsley's house, Cloverfields, was attributed to Buckland by Barbara Brand in her master's thesis (Barbara Allison Brand, "The Work of William Buckland in Maryland, 1771-1774," Master's thesis, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.). Cloverfields will be covered in this article.
5. Beirne and Scharff, *William Buckland*, p. 162, note 8.
6. Edward Lloyd Ledger, 1770-1791, Lloyd Papers, "Land Volumes, Maintenance of Property," Roll no. 6, p. 194. Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, Maryland.
7. Luke Beckerdite, "William Buckland and William Bernard Sears: the Designer and the Carver," *The Journal of Early Southern Decorative Arts*, Vol. 8, no. 2, November 1982, pp. 20-26.
8. J. Donnell Tilghman, "Bill for the Construction of the Chase House," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, Vol. 33, March 1938, pp. 23-26.

9. On 6 May 1765, sixteen year old John Randall was apprenticed to William Buckland, "Joiner & Cabinet Maker," until he reached the age of twenty-one (*Richmond County Deed Book 12*, 2 April 1765, p. 611).
10. *Anne Arundel County Inventories*, 1777, Vol. 125, p. 337. *Anne Arundel County Accounts*, 1777, Vol. 72, p. 421.
11. *Anne Arundel County Inventories*, 1777, Vol. 125, p. 337.
12. *Virginia Gazette*, 1 August 1771.
13. William Buckland to Robert Carter, 25 March 1771, Carter Family Papers, 1651-1861. MssI/C2468/145-981, Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.
14. *Maryland Gazette*, 16 December 1773.
15. On 1 August 1768, the Court of Richmond County, Virginia proved Callis' indenture to Buckland. Callis "putt himself a Prentice to WBuckland Carpenter & Joiner," for a full term of four years (*Richmond County Deed Book 13*, 1 August 1768, pp. 52-53).
16. *Richmond County Deed Book 13*, 7 November 1772, pp. 457-459.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 457.
18. William Cooke Papers, ms. 195, Maryland Historical Society.
19. Edward Lloyd Ledger, 1770-1791, p. 144.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 194.
21. *Ibid.*
22. *Ibid.*
23. Barbara Allison Brand, "Buckland in Maryland."
24. Samuel Chase paid tradesmen working on his house salaries ranging from 6/ to 7/6 per day (Tilghman, "Bill for the Construction of the Chase House," pp. 24-25).
25. Beckerdite, "William Buckland and William Bernard Sears," pp. 20-26.
26. Edward Lloyd Ledger, 1770-1791, p. 194.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 193.
28. *Maryland Gazette*, 14 February 1771.
29. *Ibid.*, 23 September 1771.
30. *The Maryland Journal, and the Baltimore Advertiser*, 27 Nov. 1773.
31. *Maryland Gazette*, 17 March 1774.
32. *Ibid.*, 7 April 1774.
33. Brand, "Buckland in Maryland," p. 44.
34. Charles Coleman Sellers, *Portraits and Minatures by Charles Willson Peale* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1952), p. 43.
35. *Anne Arundel County Accounts*, 1777, Vol. 72, p. 421.
36. *Maryland Gazette*, 15 December 1774.
37. *Anne Arundel County Inventories*, 1777, Vol. 125, p. 337.
38. *Ibid.*
39. Bill to the Commissioners of the Loan Office from William Buckland, 26 March 1774, Scharff Papers, ms. 1999, Maryland Historical Society.
40. *Anne Arundel County Inventories*, 1777, Vol. 125, p. 337.

41. *Maryland Gazette*, 3 November 1774.
42. Beirne and Scharff, *William Buckland*, p. 101. Brand, "Buckland in Maryland," p. 81.
43. Memorandum Book of Robert Wormley Carter, 6 February 1766, Folder 19, Manuscripts Department, Earl Gregg Swem Library, The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.
44. Edward Lloyd Ledger, 1770-1791, p. 194.
45. John J. McCusker, *Money and Exchange in Europe and America, 1600-1775* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978), table 3.8, p. 199.
46. Beirne and Scharff, *William Buckland*, p. 101. Brand, "Buckland in Maryland," p. 82.
47. Beirne and Scharff, *William Buckland*, p. 96.
48. Russell J. Wright, "The Restoration of the Interior of the William Paca House," *The Magazine Antiques*, Vol 111, January 1977, p. 162.
49. Papenfuse, *In Pursuit of Profit*, p. 38.
50. James Brice Account Book, microfilm M1207, loose sheet, Maryland Hall of Records, Annapolis, Maryland.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 24.
52. *Ibid.*, loose sheet.
53. In 1770, carpenters and joiners working on the Brice House were paid salaries ranging from 5/6 to 6/ per day. William Bampton was included in the list of joiners in the account book (*Ibid.*, loose sheet).
54. *Ibid.*, p. 28.
55. Beirne and Scharff, *William Buckland*, p. 127.
56. Raymond B. Clark, Jr., "The Abbey, or Ringgold House at Chestertown, Maryland," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, Vol. 46, June 1951, pp. 84-85. Beirne and Scharff, *William Buckland*, pp. 79-81. Brand, "Buckland in Maryland," pp. 36-41.
57. Clark, "The Abbey, or Ringgold House," p. 82.
58. See Paul Clemens, *Atlantic Economy of Colonial Maryland's Eastern Shore* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980); Ronald Hoffman, *A Spirit of Dissension: Economics, Politics and the Revolution in Maryland* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973); and Carville W. Earle and Ronald Hoffman, "Urban Development in the Eighteenth Century South," *Perspectives in American History*, 10 (1976), pp. 7-78.
59. Thomas Ringgold to John Cadwalader, 18 January 1775 and 21 April 1776 and Thomas Ringgold and Co. to John Cadwalader, 21 October-9 December 1769 and 13 January 1772, Cadwalader Collection—General John Cadwalader, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
60. Pennsylvania-Philadelphia Account Book, 1768-1787, p. 144, Rare Books and Manuscripts Division, New York Public Library, New York, New York. This account book was identified as Randolph's by comparison with his receipt book owned by the H. F. duPont Winterthur Museum (Philadelphia Museum of Art, *Philadelphia: Three Centuries of American Art* [Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1976], p. 111).
61. *Philadelphia: Three Centuries of American Art*, pp. 110-115.

62. MESDA Research File S-9444.
63. Thomas Johnson published an untitled collection of designs in 1758. In that publication, the hunting scene was the 30th plate. (Helena Hayward, *Thomas Johnson and English Rococo* [London: Alec Tiranti, 1964], vii).
64. *Anne Arundel County Inventories, 1777*, Vol. 125, p. 337.
65. Nicholas B. Wainwright, *Colonial Grandeur in Philadelphia: the House and Furniture of General John Cadwalader* (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1964), p. 46.
66. Pennsylvania-Philadelphia Account Book, p. 77.

For assistance with this article the author would like to thank Ms. Elizabeth Giblin; Ms. Barbara Brand, Administrator of the Hammond-Harwood House; Mrs. John P. Symonds, President of Historic Annapolis, Inc.; Mr. Richard W. McClelland; Mr. Ray Lackey; Mr. William Voss Elder, III., Curator of Decorative Arts at the Baltimore Museum of Art; Mrs. Martha Carter; Mr. Orlando Ridout, V.; Dr. Frank Sommer, III., Head of the H. F. duPont Winterthur Museum Library; Mr. Bert Denker, Winterthur DAPC Librarian; Mr. and Mrs. L. R. Andrews; Mr. Charles Scarlett, Jr.; Mr. and Mrs. John Thorpe Richards; Mr. and Mrs. Coleman duPont; Ms. Jane Smith; Ms. Sarah Lee Frizzel; Mr. Morrison Heckscher, Curator of American Decorative Arts at the Metropolitan Museum of Art; Peggy Scholley, and John Birvins.

MESDA seeks manuscripts which treat virtually any facet of southern decorative art for publication in the JOURNAL. The MESDA staff would also like to examine any privately-held primary research material (documents and manuscripts) from the South, and southern newspapers published in 1820 and earlier.

Back issues of *The Journal*
are available.

Photographs in this issue by the staff of the Museum of Early Southern Decorative Arts except where noted.

MUSEUM OF EARLY SOUTHERN DECORATIVE ARTS

FRANK L. HORTON, *Director*

BRADFORD L. RAUSCHENBERG, *Research Fellow*

LUKE BECKERDITE, *Research Associate*

SALLY GANT, *Education Coordinator*

ELIZABETH PUTNEY, *Associate in Education*

PAULA YOUNG, *Education Assistant*

ROSEMARY ESTES, *Archivist*

JOHN BIVINS, JR., *Publications*

JANIS PRINGLE, *Secretary/Receptionist*

